



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,876	10/10/2006	Wolfgang Theimer	P3188US00	5436

30671 7590 12/10/2010
DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.
918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

COBURN, CORBETT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

12/10/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 17-19 & 26, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Microsoft Disk Operating System (Henceforth MS-DOS).

Claims 1, 17, 19: MS-DOS had a command (DIR) for generating a game directory (i.e., listing of games) on an electronic gaming device. DIR queried an accessible memory (i.e., disk) for determining the electronic games available for execution (i.e., those files that are executable) on said electronic gaming device, and generating a game directory having entries for each electronic game which is determined – it listed the executable programs found on the disk.

Claim 2: The DIR command listed the name of the directory (or file folder) that contained the programs. This is querying the accessible memory for context data (i.e., directory name) related to said electronic games, and including said context data into said game directory.

Claims 3, 4: A user could put the programs into any directory desired. MS-DOS was inherently capable of segregating multi-player games into their own directory where the directory name indicated a multiplayer ability of the game.

Art Unit: 3714

Claim 18: MS-DOS, like any other program, can be downloaded from a server.

Claim 26: The DIR command listed the entries from the game directory on a display of the electronic gaming device. The player could then type in a command to execute one of the games. This is receiving selection data related to the displayed entries and displaying the selection data on the display (since the text entered by the user was displayed on the monitor).

Claim 28: MS-DOS is a game directory generation and game selection application. In order to use it, it must be received & installed.

Claim 29, 30: A user who types in a command to execute a game sends a request to retrieve (from disk) and transfer (to internal memory) said game directory entries.

Clearly, the device receives the requests.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS-DOS as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Martin (US Patent Number 6,337,681).

Claim 27: MS-DOS teaches the invention substantially as claimed, but fails to teach that the display is a whiteboard. Martin teaches that it was known to use MS-DOS computers to control whiteboards. (Col 1, 45 & Col 11, 15) Whiteboards provide user interaction with applications programs. (Col 1, 18-19) It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3714

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used Martin's whiteboard with the MS-DOS operating system in order to allow user interaction with applications programs.

5. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS-DOS as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hawkins et al. (US Patent Number 6,009,458).

Claim 31: It is difficult to understand what Claim 31 is claiming since it is so replete with antecedent basis errors. But Examiner believes Applicant is attempting to claim some sort of peer-to-peer networking scheme in which a player on one machine can start a game that is stored on another machine. Hawkins teaches such a peer-to-peer network. (Fig 2) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the MS-DOS operating system to implement the peer-to-peer networking scheme of Hawkins (and thus allow a player to start a game that is stored on another machine) because any computer network must have an operating system.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 30 November 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
7. Applicant argues that the DIR command does not determine the electronic games available for execution on an electronic device and generate a game directory having entries for the determined electronic games. But this is exactly what the DIR command does.
8. Suppose a user has a "Games" directory under which he has stored all of the files for the electronic games available on his computer. Typing "dir" would give him a directory of those

Art Unit: 3714

games. The dir command would determine what games were available – i.e., those loaded into the computer. And it would provide a directory listing of those games.

9. Applicant states that the DIR command “simply provides a listing of all files and subdirectories that are available in a specified directory”. That is a gaming directory – the game programs are listed. There may be other files listed too, but that does not change the fact that the game programs are listed. And that is all that is being claimed.

10. Applicant argues that DIR cannot determine which of the files refer to games. This is not commensurate in scope with the claims. Furthermore, as Applicant points out, DIR can determine which files correspond to executable programs. It is Examiner's position that unless particular elements of game play are described in the claims, any executable program can be considered a game. After all, a game is just an executable program and what is "play" is in the eyes of the beholder. One may "play" the word processing game or the spreadsheet game just as well as one may play the mine sweeper game.

11. Examiner does not contend that Applicant's invention is the same as the DIR command. Examiner does, however, contend that Applicant's claims read on the DIR command. Examiner urges Applicant to amend the claims to more closely describe Applicant's invention if Applicant chooses to continue prosecution of the case.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 3714

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corbett B. Coburn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4447. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Lewis can be reached on (571) 272-7673. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Corbett B. Coburn/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714

Application/Control Number: 10/574,876

Page 7

Art Unit: 3714